



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/540,419

01/06/2006

Matthias Hessling

10191/3932

9244

26646

7590

05/23/2008

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

SMITH, SHEILA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/540,419	Applicant(s) HESSLING ET AL.	
	Examiner SHEILA B. SMITH	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-23 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 24,25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 20 recites the limitation "encoding" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
3. Claim 21 recites the limitation "decoding" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 23 recites the limitation "decoding" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 15-17, 26,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rauhala (U.S. Patent Number 6,680,919).

Regarding claim 15, Rauhala discloses a method for transmitting location-related information from a transmitter to a receiver (which reads on column 3 lines 38-39), the method comprising including the information in a digital map of the receiver (which reads on the digital signal processor of the device, for receiving digital signals of column 3 lines 30-36); and downloading the location-related information from an Internet page (which reads on column 4 lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 16, Rauhala discloses a location-related information being offered on an Internet portal of a service provider (which reads on column 4 lines 1-5) in return for payment (It is a inherent feature that the internet is a fee for service entity) .

Regarding claim 17, Rauhala discloses a selecting a link to an Internet page of an information provider to reach the Internet page of a service provider having the location-related information which reads on column 4 lines 1-6); and providing payment by the information provider to the service provider (It is a inherent feature that the internet is a fee for service entity) for the download of the location-related information (which reads on column 3 lines 50-57).

Regarding claim 26, Rauhala discloses a navigation device comprising: a digital road map; and a receiving arrangement to receiver (which reads on column 3 lines 38-39), the method comprising including the information in a digital map of the receiver (which reads on column 3 lines 30-36); and downloading the location-related information from an Internet page (which reads on column 4 lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 27, Rauhala discloses a reception occurs via a connection to a device having an Internet connection (which reads on column 4 lines 1-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 18,19, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauhala (U.S. Patent Number 6,674,879).

Regarding claim 18, Rauhala discloses the claim as applied to claim 15 above, additionally Rauhala discloses a data set of the location-related information (which reads on column 2 lines 79-23), however Rauhala fails to specifically disclose a payment amount being calculated as a function of a data set of the location-related information.

The examiner contends, however that a payment amount being calculated is well known in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teaching of well known prior art since such a business practice is known to be widely used in the ecommerce industry.

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 19, Rauhala discloses the claim as applied to claim 15 above, additionally Rauhala discloses a provision of the location-related information on the Internet page (which reads on column 2 lines 79-23), however Rauhala fails to specifically disclose a provision of the location-related information on the Internet page being financed at least partially by advertising.

The examiner contends, however that the Internet page being financed at least partially by advertising is well know in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teaching of well known prior art since such a business practice is known to be widely used in the ecommerce industry.

Regarding claim 28, Rauhala discloses the claim as applied to claim 15 above, additionally Rauhala discloses a provision of the location-related information on the Internet page (which reads on column 2 lines 79-23), however Rauhala fails to specifically disclose a location-related information is read in from at least one of a transportable storage medium and a diskette.

The examiner contends, however a transportable storage medium and a diskette is well know in the art, and at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teaching of well known prior art since such a storage usage is known to be widely used in the industry.

5. Claims 20-23, 25 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauhala in view of Froeberg (U.S. Patent Number 6,674,879).

Regarding claim 20, Rauhala discloses the location related information of claim 15, additionally as best understood in view of the 112 rejection. Rauhala fails to disclose encoding of objects in a traffic route network, the object to be encoded being provided with at least one coordinate chain which at least partially lies on traffic routes which are also included in the receiver's database, and which includes characteristic properties of parts of the traffic route network.

In the same field of endeavor Froeberg discloses a encoding of objects in a traffic route network (which reads on column 7 lines 42-44), the object to be encoded being provided with at least one coordinate chain which at least partially lies on traffic routes which are also included in the receiver's database (which reads on column 7 lines 35-44), and which includes characteristic properties of parts of the traffic route network (which reads on column 7 lines 35-38).

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teachings of Froeberry for the purpose of facilitating a better dispatch system.

Regarding claim 21, Rauhala discloses the location related information of claim 15, additionally as best understood in view of the 112 rejection. Rauhala fails to disclose a decoding, the coordinate chain of an encoded object is compared to the receiver's database, the

Art Unit: 2617

at least one coordinate chain is assigned to the similar part of the traffic route network if similarities are present, and the non-assigned parts of the at least one coordinate chain are connected to the traffic routes of the receiver's database according to the geometric position of the assigned part.

In the same field of endeavor Froeberg discloses a decoding, the coordinate chain of an encoded object is compared to the receiver's database (which reads on column 3 lines 42-45), the at least one coordinate chain is assigned to the similar part of the traffic route network if similarities are present (which reads on column 3 lines 12-19), and the non-assigned parts of the at least one coordinate chain are connected to the traffic routes of the receiver's database according to the geometric position of the assigned part (which reads on column 3 lines 19-23).

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teachings of Froeberg for the purpose of facilitating a better dispatch system.

Regarding claim 22, , Rauhala discloses the location related information of claim 15, however, Rauhala fails to disclose, wherein the location-related information is made up of linear objects.

In the same field of endeavor Froeberg discloses the location-related information is made up of linear objects (which reads on column 5 lines 18-22).

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teachings of Froeberg for the purpose of facilitating a better dispatch system.

Regarding claim 23, Rauhala discloses a decoding, a point set of equidistant points of the linear object and of the objects of the traffic route network is formed.

In the same field of endeavor Froeberg discloses the a point set of equidistant points of the linear object and of the objects of the traffic route network is formed (which reads on column 5 lines 18-22).

Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rauhala with the teachings of Froeberg for the purpose of facilitating a better dispatch system.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 24, 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEILA B. SMITH whose telephone number is (571)272-7847.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 571-272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S.Smith /Sheila B. Smith/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617
March 30, 2008

/Naghmeh Mehrpour/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617
May 21, 2008